UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/001,766	10/31/2001	Yoshizumi Mano	09812.0171-00000	4322
	7590 11/09/200 ENDERSON, FARAB	EXAMINER		
LLP	ŕ	RUHL, DENNIS WILLIAM		
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3689	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/09/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/001,766	MANO ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	Bernille Ptarii	0000	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence addre	ss
THE REPLY FILED <u>9/18/09</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICA <sup>-</sup>	TION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOW	/ANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apple for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	it, or other evidence, wh with 37 CFR 41.31; or (	ich places the 3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire is	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection.	
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	f). on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing da	36(a) and the appropriate of the fee. The appropriate inally set in the final Office	extension fee e extension fee action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any externotice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed waternoon.</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the a	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, I  (a) They raise new issues that would require further core  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	nsideration and/or search (see NO <sup>-</sup> w);	TE below);	
<ul> <li>(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or</li> <li>(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1</li> </ul>	corresponding number of finally rej		e issues for
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	: See Continuation Sheet.		,
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	lowable if submitted in a separate,	timely filed amendment	canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  Claim(s) allowed:  Claim(s) objected to:  Claim(s) rejected:  Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		ll be entered and an exp	lanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails t	
10.   The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attached	l.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  11. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been consident because:  See Continuation Sheet.	ered but does NOT place the applic	cation in condition for all	owance
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). 13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Dennis Ruhl/ Primary Examiner, Art U	Init 3689	

## **Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)**

Application No.

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The new claim scope now appears to be positively reciting various elements that were not positively recited previously (relates to the 112,2nd rejection for claim 1). The amendment to calim 1 requires further consideration in view of the prior art due to the new claim scope. The claim also not recites that various means plus function language is the content distribution intermediary system and this was not claimed previously and was of a different scope..

Continuation of 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): the amendments appear to overcome the 101 rejection and the 112,2nd paragraph rejections.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: it is based on amended claim language that is not being entered due to new issues and new claim scope. With respect to the argument that the prior art does not disclose the physical distribution agent as receiving a delivery status, this language is just reciting what kind of data is able to be received. All that is claimed is the ability to receive data, not any specific data itself as part of the claim. Applicant argues that the prior art does not disclose "media content". This is not persuasive and is directed to non-functional descriptive material. With respect to the argument regarding the official notice, the argument is not a traversal on the merits and is nothing more than a request for evidence without even saying that the examiner is incorrect, or pointing out why the taking of official notice is not proper. If applicant will not argue the merits of the official notice, then it is not considered to be a traversal. The alleged fact is now a matter of fact for the record due to applicant not timely presenting a proper traversal to the talking of official notice. With respect to the argument relating to a "clip", it is not persuasive for the same reasons as stated in the response to arguments in the Final rejection.